



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/046,554	01/16/2002	Andrew Baker		1808
56679	7590	09/15/2006	EXAMINER	
GOSZ AND PARTNERS, LLP 450 BEDFORD STREET LEXINGTON, MA 02420			KIDWELL, MICHELE M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3761	

DATE MAILED: 09/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/046,554	BAKER, ANDREW	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michele Kidwell	3761	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 June 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-53 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 25-29 and 49-53 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-24 and 30-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

This application contains claims 25 – 29 and 49 – 53 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in the election dated July 29, 2004. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 – 14, 17 – 38 and 41 – 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chmielewski (US 6,068,620).

As to claims 1 and 30, Chmielewski discloses an absorbent article having a longitudinal dimension and a lateral dimension comprising: a top sheet (30); a back sheet (32); and a multi-component absorbent core composite (34) disposed between the top sheet and the back sheet; wherein the multi-component absorbent core composite includes a first (340a) and two (342a, 344) separate second absorbent core units, the first core unit having different properties from the second core units (col. 8, line 56 to col. 9, line 40) where the first absorbent core unit is comprised of a mixture of

Art Unit: 3761

tow fibers and superabsorbent polymer (SAP) and wherein the first absorbent core unit is positioned in a lateral direction parallel to the topsheet and backsheets between the second core units in side-to-side relationship as set forth in col. 11, line 47 to col. 12, line 9 and in figure 3.

The recited steps of the method claim are inherently included in the rejection of claim 1 as shown in figures 3 – 4.

With reference to claim 2, Chmielewski discloses an absorbent article whereby the article has a first waist region (22), a second waist region (24) longitudinally opposed to the first waist region, and a crotch region (26) between the first and second waist regions, the article further comprising at least one fastening element attached to a lateral edge of the first waist region (40); and one or more target devices attached to the article in the second waist region, where at least one fastening element and the one or more target devices are capable of attaching to one another, the one or more target devices being located so that the first waist region and second waist region of the garment may be joined to one another to secure the garment on a wearer as set forth in col. 5, lines 24 – 51 and in figure 1.

Regarding claim 3, Chmielewski discloses an absorbent article further comprising elastic leg gathers (36) comprising one or more elastic materials disposed adjacent a lateral edge of the crotch region, and standing leg gathers disposed on the top sheet adjacent the lateral edge of the crotch region as set forth in col. 7, line 59 to col. 8, line 6 and in figure 1.

As to claim 4, Chmielewski discloses an absorbent article wherein the at least one fastening element comprises a hook portion of a hook and loop fastener and the one or more target devices comprise the loop portion of a hook and loop fastener as set forth in col. 5, lines 41 – 42.

With respect to claim 5, Chmielewski discloses an absorbent article wherein the at least one fastening element is an adhesive tape and the one or more target devices comprise a tape receiving surface as set forth in col. 5, lines 41 – 42.

With reference to claim 6, Chmielewski discloses an absorbent article wherein the at least one fastening element is comprised of a pair of laterally extending tabs disposed on the lateral edges of the first waist region, whereby the laterally extending tabs each include at least one fastening element in col. 5, lines 41 – 42 and in figure 1.

Regarding claims 7 and 31, Chmielewski discloses an absorbent article wherein at least one additional layer (344) is disposed between the multi-component absorbent core composite and the top sheet as set forth in figures 3 – 4.

As to claims 8 and 32, Chmielewski discloses an absorbent article wherein the at least one additional layer (344) is selected from the group consisting of a fluid acquisition layer, a distribution layer, an additional fibrous layer optionally containing SAP, a wicking layer, a storage layer, and combinations and fragments thereof as set forth in col. 10, lines 16 – 18.

With respect to claims 9 and 33, Chmielewski discloses an absorbent article wherein one of the absorbent core units (350) includes at least one additional layer (350b) as set forth in col. 9, line 45 to col. 10, line 7 and in figure 3.

As to claims 10 and 34, Chmielewski discloses an absorbent article wherein the at least one additional layer is selected from the group consisting of a fluid acquisition layer, a distribution layer, an additional fibrous layer optionally containing SAP, a wicking layer, a storage layer, and combinations and fragments thereof as set forth in col. 9, lines 46 – 49.

Regarding claims 11 and 35, Chmielewski discloses an absorbent article wherein the absorbent core unit that includes tow and SAP is a multi-layered absorbent core unit including two outer tissue layers (col. 9, line 45 to col. 10, line 7) and a central layer that comprises from about 50% to about 95% by weight super absorbent polymer (SAP) as set forth in col. 10, lines 11 – 15.

The SAP efficiency is considered a product by process limitation. The applicant is reminded that:

"[E]ven though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process." *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (citations omitted)

Further, since the absorbent core unit of Chmielewski meets the claimed limitations regarding the tow, the SAP percentages and the provision of having two outer tissue layers, the SAP efficiency would be inherently identical to that claimed.

As to claims 12 and 36, Chmielewski discloses an absorbent article wherein the central layer comprises tow fibers selected from the group consisting of cellulose acetate fibers, rayon fibers, LYOCCELL fibers, polyacrylonitrile fibers, cotton fibers and cotton linter fibers as set forth in col. 11, line 54 to col. 12, line 9.

With reference to claims 13 and 37, Chmielewski discloses an absorbent article of claim 11, wherein the central layer further comprises up to 10% by weight fluff wood pulp fibers as set forth in col. 11, line 54 to col. 12, line 9.

Regarding claims 14 and 38, Chmielewski discloses an absorbent article wherein the central layer further comprises particulate additives as set forth in col. 11, lines 47 – 52.

As to claims 17 and 41, Chmielewski discloses an absorbent article wherein the at least one second absorbent core unit is comprised of the same materials as the first absorbent core unit in differing amounts as set forth in col. 11, lines 38 – 46.

With reference to claims 18 and 42, Chmielewski discloses an absorbent article wherein both the first and the at least one second absorbent core unit comprise at least fiber and SAP, and the at least one second absorbent core unit has a different SAP:fiber ratio than the first absorbent core unit as set forth in col. 9, lines 45 – 65 and in col. 12, lines 59 – 62.

With respect to claims 19 and 43, Chmielewski discloses an absorbent article wherein the at least one second absorbent core unit is comprised of at least one different material than the first absorbent core unit as set forth in col. 11, lines 42 – 46.

As to claims 20 and 44, Chmielewski discloses an absorbent article wherein the at least one second absorbent core unit includes a different fibrous component than the first absorbent core unit as set forth in col. 11, lines 42 – 46.

With reference to claims 21 and 45, Chmielewski discloses an absorbent article wherein the at least one second absorbent core unit does not include a fibrous component as set forth in col. 12, lines 35 – 44.

With reference to claims 22 and 46, Chmielewski discloses an absorbent article where the at least one second absorbent core unit includes a different SAP than the first absorbent core unit as set forth in col. 9, line 55 to col. 10, line 5; col. 10, lines 29 – 35 and in figure 3.

As to claims 23 and 47, Chmielewski discloses an absorbent article wherein the at least one second absorbent core unit includes a different amount of adhesive than that used in the first absorbent core unit as set forth in col. 18, line 66 to col. 19, line 2.

As to claims 24 and 48, Chmielewski discloses an absorbent article wherein the first absorbent core unit is disposed between two second absorbent core units as set forth in figures 3 – 4.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 15 – 16 and 39 – 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chmielewski (US 6,068,620).

The difference between Chmielewski and claim 15 is the provision that the tow is a cellulose ester tow.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the article of Chmielewski with a cellulose ester tow since Chmielewski discloses the use of cellulose tow and the substitution of one type of tow for another is within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

With reference to claim 16, see col. 11, lines 64 – 67.

Regarding claims 39 – 40, see the rejection of claims 15 – 16.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed June 26, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to the applicant's argument that Chmielewski does not disclose every element of the claimed invention in that element 344 of Chmielewski is described as a transfer layer, the examiner refers to col. 11, lines 30 – 31 that disclose the materials of element 344 to include absorbent materials. The claimed invention requires a multi component structure to be disposed between a topsheet and a backsheets. Even though the reference states that the element 344 is not technically part of the absorbent core of the Chmielewski reference, the examiner contends that for examination

purposes, element 344 may be interpreted as part of the claimed multi component absorbent core in that it is disposed between the topsheet and backsheet and comprises absorbent material.

As far as the arrangement of the absorbent core units, the examiner contends that the first absorbent core unit (340a) is parallel to the topsheet and the backsheet in a lateral direction as claimed and is located between the units in a side to side relationship in that the left and right side of 340a is surrounded by 342a and the upper side of 340a is underneath the bottom side of 344.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**.

See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michele Kidwell whose telephone number is 571-272-4935. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tatyana Zalukaeva can be reached on 571-272-1115. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Michele Kidwell
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3761